

03/05/03 15:15

REMARKS:

The rejection of claims in view of Japanese Laid-Open Utility Model document No. 100976, either alone or in combination, is respectfully traversed. Hereinafter, the Laid-Open Utility Model is referred to as "the '976 document."

Turning to independent claim 1, the claim recites that the inductor forming member has a ring-like portion. Further, claim 1 recites that the inductor forming member is fixed to the rotor yoke by forcing protrusion means formed on the peripheral wall of the rotor yoke against one and another axial ends of the ring-like portion. In distinction, the '976 document has a cup like inductor forming member that has no protrusions. As such, the '976 document clearly fails to provide the requisite structure. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Turning to independent claim 3, the Office action cites the patent to Richter (U.S. Patent No. 3,925,694) for asserted teachings of a peripheral wall of a rotor yoke that has a first outer peripheral area of first outside diameter, a second outer peripheral area of outside diameter that is smaller than the first outer peripheral area, and a third outer peripheral area of outside diameter smaller than the second outer peripheral area provided sequentially in order in an axial direction of the rotor yoke. As is best seen in Fig. 2 of the Richter patent, the outer diameter of the sections S_1 and S_2 are both equal. Also, the ring like portion of the inductor forming member is not fitted onto an outer surface of a second peripheral area. The strips B are suspended between grooves N of the two portions S_1 and S_2 . So further, the Richter patent does not disclose inductor forming member that is fixed by deforming an end of the second outer peripheral area on the side of the third peripheral area. As mentioned, the strips are suspended by grooves. As such, the Richter patent fails to provide all of these limitations that the Richter patent is asserted to allegedly contain. In view of the lack of such structure between both the '976 document and the Richter patent, even a combination of the teachings of these documents would not provide the invention as set forth in claim 3. Therefore, independent claim 3 is allowable.

With regard to independent claims 4 and 6, the Office action asserts that Nakano (JP 56038964 A) includes a peripheral wall of the rotor yoke on an outer surface thereof having a plurality of protrusions including a first protrusion portion extending in an axial direction of said rotor yoke and a second protrusion extending in a circumferential direction of the rotor yoke at an end of the first protrusion portion.

However, the Nakano device does not have such structure. It is queried where the Examiner believes such structure is present.

Further, the Office action states that the Nakano device provided an inductor forming member on an inner surface of the ring like portion having recesses corresponding to the first protrusion portion of the plurality of protrusions, respectively, so that the first protrusion portions are engaged with the corresponding recesses. Again, the Nakano device does not have such structure and it is queried where the Examiner believes such structure is present.

Also, the Office action states that the Nakano device provides an inductor forming member that is fixed to the rotor yoke by forcing the second protrusion portion of each of the protrusions against one axial end of the ring-like portion of the inductor member and by forcing a projection formed by raising another end of the first protrusion against the other axial end of the ring like member. Such structure is lacking.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 6 are allowable in view of the asserted combination of teachings that contain teachings from the Nakano document.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Associated with this response, the applicant's representative wishes to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner. As such, the applicant's representative will be contacting the Examiner to schedule such an interview.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge such fee to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Account No. 33498.

Respectfully submitted,
Pearne & Gordon LLP

By: 
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

526 Superior Avenue East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484

March 5, 2003

3 FAX RECEIVED

MAR 5 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800